UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/579,768	05/18/2006	Satoshi Mihara	21713-00058-US1	3575	
	30678 7590 07/16/2008 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			EXAMINER	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			BUIE, NICOLE M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/579,768	MIHARA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	NICOLE M. BUIE	1796
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withden 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 and 9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification of the s	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement. ner. ccepted or b) □ objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the l	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060518 / 20060929 / 20080327.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 05/18/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the foreign patent documents, JP 2002-003652, JP 09-328631, and JP 05-017705 have not been considered since there is no copy of the full foreign document. The Patent Abstracts of Japan were the only documents submitted.

The information disclosure statement filed 09/26/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the no copy of the foreign documents JP-59-206469 and EP-0177674 have been provided.

The information disclosure statement filed 03/27/2008 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the non-patent literature document "Office Action for Corresponding Chinese Patent Application No. 200480034067.1 dated February 15, 2008" does not include a concise explanation of the relevance.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. Furthermore, claims must refer back to and further limit another claim or claims in the same application. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim does not end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cruse et al. (US 2002/0055568).

Regarding claim 1, Cruse et al. discloses silane coupling agents (i.e. "3-trimethoxysilyl-1-propyl thiooctanoate", "3-triethoxysilyl-1-propyl thiooctanoate", [0030], claim 7). Cruse et al. further discloses that generally, only the reaction of the silane SiX3 group with the filler (i.e. silica [0078]) can occur in a step of the compounding process [0060].

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding claim 2, the Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. bulk density retention rate would implicitly be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Cruse et al. discloses 0.05 to 20 parts by weight filler of at least one silane coupling agent [0074] (compared to $1 \le$ (the weight of silane coupling agent X/the weight of silica before treatment)x100 \le 25 as required by said claim).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 3 and 9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 11/573619.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Application '619 recites a silane-coupling agent-treated silica where the silane coupling agent includes 3-triethyoxysilylpropyl thioacetate, 3-trimethoxysilylpropyl thioacetate, 3-octanoylthiopropyl trimethoxysilane, or 3-octanoylthiopropyl tripropxysilane (claim 2). Application '619 also recites 1 to 50 parts by mass of silane coupling agent (claim 1).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICOLE M. BUIE whose telephone number is (571)270-3879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571)272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,768 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARK EASHOO, PhD./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 15-Jul-08 /N. M. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 1796 7/9/2008